

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ERICA BLUTH, et al,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

TYLER MICHAEL BAEHR, et al,

Defendants.

Case Number 3:25-cv-00129-ART-CSD

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

Dated: June 18, 2025

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE CRAIG S. DENNEY, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: Ashlyn Bye REPORTER: Liberty Court Recorder

COUNSEL FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Luke Busby (with Lauren Gorman at 10:50 a.m.)

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT CITY OF RENO: Peter Keegan

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT BAEHR: Tyler Baehr

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS: MOTION HEARING

10:28 a.m. Court convenes.

The Court addresses the parties on the purpose of today's hearing and has reviewed the Plaintiffs' Second Motion Regarding Discovery Dispute (ECF No. 45). In addition to the motion, the Court has reviewed the Responses (ECF Nos. 48 & 49) and the Plaintiffs' related Motion to Seal Document (ECF No. 46).

Counsel present arguments and respond to the Court's inquiries.

Mr. Busby argues that Marsy's Law does not apply under these circumstances and that the mere identity of a potential victim is not covered under this statute. Mr. Busby further argues that Mr. Baehr presumably knows the identities of those individuals whose names are redacted in the Internal Affairs investigation report.

Mr. Keegan advises that the Sparks Police Department is investigating and that any victim notifications would come from them. Mr. Keegan further advises that the Internal Affairs investigation is separate from the investigation by Sparks Police Department. Mr. Keegan argues that the people listed in the Internal Affairs report are presumptively victims and he has no authority to disclose their identities. Mr. Keegan further argues that the Plaintiffs are challenging

ERICA BLUTH, et al v. TYLER MICHAEL BAEHR, et al
Case Number 3:25-cv-00129-ART-CSD

1 the confidentiality designation.

2 Mr. Busby argues that the challenge of confidentiality is not before the Court and that he
3 does not think that Internal Affairs reports are generally subject to confidentiality provisions. Mr.
4 Busby refers to District Judge Traum's Order entered in *McElroy et al v. City of Reno et al* (3:23-
cv-00451-ART-CSD, ECF No. 52).

5 Mr. Baehr has nothing further to add.

6 At 10:56 a.m., court stands at recess.

7 At 11:17 a.m., court reconvenes. All parties are present.

8 The Court has reviewed District Judge Traum's Order and finds that it is not regarding the
9 same issue in this matter. The Court recites findings on the record. The Court will grant the
10 Plaintiffs leave to refile this motion once District Judge Du rules on the Motion to Stay Case (ECF
11 No. 22). If the Motion to Stay is denied, the Court will order additional briefing to address
12 disclosure of victim information in the Internal Affairs report and provide recommendations on
13 how victims or witnesses would be notified. Further, the parties will be directed to meet and
14 confer then provide the Court with a requested briefing schedule within fourteen (14) days from
District Judge Du's Order to revisit the request to obtain the victim information in the report.

15 **IT IS ORDERED** that the Plaintiffs' Motion to Seal Document (ECF No. 46) is granted.

16 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Plaintiffs' Second Motion Regarding Discovery
17 Dispute (ECF No. 45) is denied.

18 There being no additional matters to address at this time, court adjourns at 11:28 a.m.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DEBRA K. KEMPI, CLERK

20 By: /s/
Ashlyn Bye, Deputy Clerk